

Chad
18. (Previously Presented) The digital camera of claim 17, wherein in the non-printing mode, the photographing means allows manual setting of resolution and compression.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-18 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are independent.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate that the Examiner has indicated claims 8, 15, and 16 define allowable subject matter.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on January 7, 2004. In the interview, it was agreed that claim 4 as currently written is allowable over prior art of record. More specifically, it was

agreed that the prior art of record do not teach or suggest that certification is performed by the requester.

§ 102 REJECTION - ALLEN, WALKER

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allen et al. (USPN 5,737,491, hereinafter "Allen") in view of Walker et al. (USPN 6,381,582, hereinafter "Walker"). See *Final Office Action*, pages 3-4, item 1. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As noted above, it was agreed during the interview that claim 4 as written is distinguishable over Allen and Walker. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4, based on Allen and Walker, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION - ALLEN, INOUE, WALKER

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allen in view of Inoue (USPN 5,710,954) in further view of Walker. See *Final Office Action*, pages 4-12, items 2-10. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, "requester has confirmed the content of the output instruction." Independent claims 2, 3, and 5 have been amended to recite a similar feature. As noted above, it was agreed during the interview that none of the cited references, in any combination, teaches or suggests at least the feature recited above.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 2, 3, and 5 are distinguishable over the combination of Allen, Inoue, and Walker. Claims 6-7 and 10-12 depend from independent claim 5, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 5, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Allen, Inoue, and Walker as well as on their own merits.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7 and 10-12, based on Allen, Inoue, and Walker, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION - ALLEN, INOUE, WALKER, SLOTZNICK

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allen in view of Inoue in further view of Walker and in further view of Slotznick (USPN

U.S. Application No. 09/219,121

Docket No. 2091-0182P

January 26, 2004

Art Unit: 2612

Page 16 of 19

5,983,200). See *Final Office Action*, pages 12-13, items 11-12.

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 5, directly or indirectly. As noted above, it was agreed that the amended claim 5 is distinguishable over all cited references including Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Slotznick. Therefore, for the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 5, dependent claims 13 and 14 are also distinguishable from the combination of combination of Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Slotznick as well as on their own merits.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13 and 14, based on Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Slotznick, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION - ALLEN, INOUE, WALKER, MATHERS

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allen in view of Inoue in further view of Walker and in further view of Mathers et al. (USPN 6,012,145, hereinafter "Mathers"). See *Final Office Action*, pages 13-14, item 13. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 5. As noted above, it was agreed that the amended claim 5 is distinguishable over all cited references including Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Mathers. Therefore, for the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 5, dependent claim 9 is also distinguishable from the combination of combination of Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Mathers as well as on its own merit.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9, based on Allen, Inoue, Walker, and Mathers, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION - ALLEN, INOUE, WALKER, PARULSKI, WATANABE

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allen in view of Inoue in further view of Walker and in further view of Parulski et al. (USPN 5,440,343, hereinafter "Parulski") and in further view of Watanabe (USPN 6,529,236). See *Final Office Action*, pages 14-15, items 14-15. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from independent claim 5, directly or indirectly. As noted above, it was agreed that the amended claim 5 is distinguishable over all cited references including Allen, Inoue, Walker, Parulski, and Watanabe. Therefore, for

the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 5, dependent claims 17 and 18 are also distinguishable from the combination of combination of Allen, Inoue, Walker, Parulski, and Watanabe as well as on their own merits.

Thus, for the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 5, dependent claims 17 and 18 are also distinguishable from the combination of combination of Allen, Inoue, Walker, Parulski, and Watanabe as well as on their own merit.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17 and 18, based on Allen, Inoue, Walker, Parulski, and Watanabe be withdrawn.

NO NEW ISSUES

It is respectfully submitted that no new issues have been presented. The amendments to claims 1, 2, 3, and 5 present the same issue as in independent claim 4, which has been examined and resolved.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Final Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that

U.S. Application No. 09/219,121

Docket No. 2091-0182P

January 26, 2004

Art Unit: 2612

Page 19 of 19

the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter
Reg. No. 29,680

MKM/HNS/jeb
HNS
2091-0182P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000